

AMS/FAST CHANGE REQUEST (CR) COVERSHEET

Change Request Number: 19-09

Date Received: 2/12/19

Title: AMS Section 2.8.2.4 Proposed Revisions

Initiator Name: John Sze

Initiator Organization Name / Routing Code: Acquisition Policy Division, AAP-100

Initiator Phone: 202-267-0311

ASAG Member Name: John Sze

ASAG Member Phone: 202-267-0311

Policy and Guidance: (check all that apply)

- ☒ Policy
- ☐ Procurement Guidance
- ☐ Real Estate Guidance
- ☐ Other Guidance
- ☐ Non-AMS Changes

Summary of Change:

Annual review of investment planning artifacts as well as clarification of decision point entrance criteria.

Reason for Change:

The artifact updates were part of an annual review from the Acquisition Readiness Team (ART). AMS Policy review reflects how the process been working in practice.

Development, Review, and Concurrence: AAP-100, AAP-200, AAP-1 (Acting), OGB Secretariat, Acquisition Readiness Team (ART)

Target Audience: Ops-funded, mission support capital investment customers

Briefing Planned: Yes. Briefed the ASAG on 02/19/19. Briefed the AEB on 3/7/19.

ASAG Responsibilities: Review and comment.

Section / Text Location: AMS Policy Section 2.8

The redline version must be a comparison with the current published FAST version.

- ☒ I confirm I used the latest published version to create this change / redline
or
☐ This is new content

Links:

https://fast.faa.gov/docs/acquisitionManagementPolicy/AcquisitionManagementPolicy_2.pdf

Attachments: Redline and final documents.

Other Files: N/A

Redline(s):

Section Revised:

2.8.2.4 Planning Artifacts

2.8.3.4 Business Case Decision (decision point 2)

2.8.3.6 Investment Commitment Decision (decision point 3)

2.8.3.7 Deployment

Acquisition Management Policy - (~~14~~/2019)

2.8 Mission Support Operations-Funded Lifecycle Management Policy Added 1/2017

2.8.1 Overview Revised 10/2018

2.8.2 Governance Added 1/2017

2.8.2.1 Authority Revised 10/2018

2.8.2.2 Scope Revised 10/2018

2.8.2.3 Operations Governance Board Revised 10/2018

2.8.2.4 Planning Artifacts Revised ~~10/2018~~4/2019

2.8.2.5 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Participants Revised 10/2018

2.8.2.6 Governance Paths Revised 10/2018

2.8.3 Mission Support Operations-Funded Process Revised 10/2018

2.8.3.1 Need Assessment Revised 10/2018

2.8.3.2 Governance Path Readiness Decision (decision point 1) Revised 10/2018

2.8.3.3 Alternatives Analysis Revised 10/2018

2.8.3.4 Business Case Decision (decision point 2) Revised ~~10/2018~~4/2019

2.8.3.5 Solution Development Revised 10/2018

2.8.3.6 Investment Commitment Decision (decision point 3) Revised ~~10/2018~~4/2019

2.8.3.7 Deployment Revised ~~10/2018~~4/2019

2.8.3.8 Operation and Retirement Added 1/2017

2.8 Mission Support Operations-Funded Lifecycle Management Policy Added 1/2017

2.8.1 Overview Revised 10/2018

The Mission Support Operations-funded process establishes policy and guidance for all aspects of acquisition management for Federal Aviation Administration procurement of Mission Support Operations-funded capital investment initiatives. The objectives are to increase quality, reduce time, manage risk, and minimize the cost of delivering safe and secure Operations-funded capital assets and services. This policy promotes these objectives through partnership among service providers and customers to ensure FAA plans, programs, and budgets address priority agency and end-user needs.

Lifecycle acquisition management for Mission Support Operations-funded capital investments is built around a logical sequence of phases and decision points. The FAA uses these phases and decision points to determine and prioritize its needs, make sound investment decisions, implement solutions efficiently, and manage services and assets over their lifecycle. The overarching goal is continuous improvement in the delivery of safe, secure, and efficient assets and services over time. The Mission Support Operations-funded process is flexible and may be tailored by the Acquisition Executive Board (AEB), Joint Resources Council (JRC), or Operations Governance Board (OGB).

2.8.2 Governance Added 1/2017

2.8.2.1 Authority Revised 10/2018

The JRC oversees all capital investments at FAA regardless of funding appropriation whether Operations and Maintenance, Research, Engineering & Development, Airport Improvement Program, or Facilities and Equipment. The JRC delegates investment decision-making for Mission Support Operations-funded capital investments to the OGB. Mission Support strategy development is conducted by the Information Technology Shared Services Committee (ITSSC), which also oversees the performance of information technology investments.

2.8.2.2 Scope Revised 10/2018

The OGB oversees investment initiatives with the following three attributes:

- Mission Support
 - Investments not included in the NAS Enterprise Architecture
 - Investments included in the Mission Support Enterprise Architecture
 - Investments not included in either architecture, but deemed within scope by the OGB or JRC

- ❑ Operations-funded
 - Investments that providers intend to fund entirely from the Operations and Maintenance account
- ❑ Capital Investment
 - Acquisition of a new or modernized FAA product, system, or service that results in a capital asset such as land, structures, equipment, or intellectual property (including software)
 - Typically has a useful life of two years or more
 - Generally does not include investments associated with the repair, operation, or maintenance of previously fielded assets

While capital investments are generally funded out of the Facilities and Equipment account, FAA Order 2500.8B specifies that the Operations account can fund capital purchases to support administrative functions. The OGB oversees these investments.

2.8.2.3 Operations Governance Board **Revised 10/2018**

Through delegation from the JRC, the OGB is the investment decision authority for Mission Support Operations-funded capital investments. It has permanent members from the following organizations:

- ❑ Acquisitions & Business Services (ACQ)
- ❑ Investment Planning and Analysis (AFI-1)
- ❑ Chief Counsel (AGC)
- ❑ Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
- ❑ Aviation Safety (AVS)
- ❑ Information and Technology Services (AIT)

Representatives from the appropriate line of business attend OGB meetings ad hoc when the investment initiative relates to their business or organizational interests.

2.8.2.4 Planning Artifacts **Revised ~~10/2018~~4/2019**

The following planning artifacts are required for all Mission Support Operations-funded capital investment initiatives:

- ❑ Intake Form
- ❑ Management Plan
- ❑ Functional and ~~Performance~~Non-Functional Requirements
- ❑ Government and Market Survey
- ❑ Acquisition Strategy

- Scaled Business Case

Templates and instructions for these artifacts are located on the FAA Acquisition System Toolset at: <http://fast.faa.gov/>

Artifacts and artifact requirements may be tailored by the AEB, JRC, or OGB.

2.8.2.5 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Participants Revised 10/2018

- Acquisition Readiness Team (ART) - advises and supports customers to develop planning artifacts for Mission Support Operations-funded capital investment initiatives. Typically, ART assists those investments assigned Governance Path C unless otherwise designated by the OGB.
- Shared Services Mission Support Information Technology Portfolio Assessment Subcommittee (reports to ITSSC) - monitors post-decision performance of Mission Support Operations-funded capital investments in accordance with the artifacts provided to support OGB investment commitment decisions. It reports progress, constraints, and challenges to key stakeholders and FAA executives.
- OGB Secretariat – conducts preliminary risk reviews for the purpose of making governance path recommendations to the OGB and provides administrative support and technical advice to the OGB.
- Business Partnership Manager – manages customer relations for AIT to capture new customer needs.
- Customer – any FAA organization seeking to execute a Mission Support Operations-funded capital investment. The customer is responsible for completing the required planning artifacts, securing OGB approvals, and retaining planning artifacts and related decision documents with investment program records.

2.8.2.6 Governance Paths Revised 10/2018

The OGB assigns a governance path to each Mission Support Operations-funded capital investment.

Governance Path A – The OGB determines the initiative poses very low risk and low funding requirements. The program office or service organization is directed to complete the appropriate planning artifacts as directed by the OGB and proceed to solution development and deployment at the governance path readiness decision. Completion of planning artifacts

is mandatory although there is no independent confirmation other than random spot checks and reviews.

Governance Path B – The OGB determines the initiative poses low to medium risk and higher funding requirements. The program office or service organization is directed to complete all planning artifacts and any OGB-directed checklist items. Approval to proceed may occur at the governance path readiness decision pending verification by the OGB Secretariat that all planning artifacts and checklist items have been completed. Completion of planning artifacts is mandatory and after verification, the investment is subject to random spot checks and reviews.

Governance Path C – The OGB determines the initiative poses medium to high risk and high funding requirements. The program office or service organization is directed to work with an ART to prepare all planning artifacts and any OGB-directed checklist items. The initiative returns to the OGB for a business case decision once all planning artifacts are confirmed as complete and of high quality by the ART and OGB Secretariat. The OGB may approve the program to enter the deployment phase or it may direct further work on the planning artifacts to be presented at the investment commitment decision. Completion of planning artifacts is mandatory and after approval, the investment is subject to monitoring by the Acquisition Policy and Oversight organization (AAP) and ITSSC.

2.8.3 Mission Support Operations Funded Process Revised 10/2018

The following phases and decision points constitute the Mission Support Operations-funded process. The actual path taken by each investment initiative depends on the governance path assigned by the OGB.



Figure 2.8.3

2.8.3.1 Need Assessment Revised 10/2018

If the proposed investment is subject to OGB oversight, lines of business / business owners complete an intake form describing the project name, business owner contact information, estimated lifecycle costs, business problem/need description, business drivers/mandates, and when the product needs to be delivered to the user community. The intake form is submitted to the OGB Secretariat at least 21 days before the commitment of funding to any contract, task order, or inter-agency agreement (IAA) in support of the proposed project. The OGB Secretariat reviews the intake form and recommends a governance path for the initiative to the OGB. The FAA Information Technology (AIT) organization will not authorize funds to be

expended on behalf of any Path C investment prior to receiving an OGB decision.

2.8.3.2 Governance Path Readiness Decision (decision point 1) Revised 10/2018

At the governance path readiness decision, the OGB assigns a governance path to the investment. Based on the approved governance path, the OGB may assign an ART to support the customer to complete the required planning artifacts and any other OGB-directed checklist items.

Entrance Criteria:

- ☐ Intake Form

The OGB:

- ☐ Approves the governance path recommended by the OGB Secretariat and assigns an ART (if applicable) with representatives from relevant stakeholder organizations; or
- ☐ Selects an alternative governance path based on OGB member consensus; or
- ☐ Returns the initiative to the sponsoring line of business for additional discovery (e.g., requirements definition or additional market research).

2.8.3.3 Alternatives Analysis Revised 10/2018

The sponsoring line of business / business owner creates the required planning artifacts with support from an ART (if assigned) for the investment initiative. The analysis typically often focuses on alternative acquisition approaches not necessarily on technical alternatives. An ART assesses whether the alternative emerging from the analysis fits within the overall agency strategy for obtaining the operational capability and can provide the performance and functionality needed by users.

The results of alternatives analysis helps the OGB determine which potential investments would improve agency operations and deliver desired outcomes to end users. This supports sound capital investment planning, which guides and prioritizes current and future Mission Support, Operations-funded projects. These analyses also help refine and mature agency plans by providing decision-makers with a clear picture of investment opportunities and their risks and value.

2.8.3.4 Business Case Decision (decision point 2) Revised 10/2018/2019

At the business case decision, the OGB validates that the preliminary scaled business case fits within the overall agency strategy for obtaining the operational capability and can provide the performance and functionality needed by users.

Entrance Criteria:

- ☐ ~~Management Plan~~
- ☐ Functional and ~~Performance~~Non-Functional Requirements
- ☐ Government and Market Survey
- ☐ ~~Acquisition Strategy~~
- ☐ Preliminary Scaled Business Case

The OGB:

- ☐ Approves the investment to enter solution development to complete planning artifacts along with any additional OGB-directed requirements, or
- ☐ Returns the investment to alternatives analysis to refine or modify planning artifacts, or
- ☐ Recommends the initiative be paused, modified, or cancelled.

2.8.3.5 Solution Development **Revised 10/2018**

The sponsoring line of business / business owner with support from an ART (if assigned), reviews and revises required planning artifacts, verifies their completeness and accuracy, and executes any other direction from the OGB (e.g., prepares request or offer, task order, or interagency agreement).

2.8.3.6 Investment Commitment Decision (decision point 3) **Revised 10/2018/2019**

At the investment commitment decision, the OGB accepts the final required planning artifacts and approves the investment for deployment or rejects the planning artifacts and specifies any further required actions.

Entrance Criteria:

- ☐ Final scaled business case
- ☐ Management Plan
- ☐ Acquisition Strategy

The OGB reviews the final scaled business case and other planning artifacts ensuring the investment presents an opportunity to improve operating capability, satisfy customer service needs, and is a sensible use of agency resources. It then:

- ☐ Approves the project to enter deployment, or
- ☐ Returns the initiative to the solution development phase for additional work, or
- ☐ Recommends the initiative for termination.

2.8.3.7 Deployment Revised 10/2018/2019

Deployment begins at the investment commitment decision when the OGB approves an investment program and recommends the line of business / business owner proceed with implementation. The deployment phase ends when the new service or capability is operational at all locations.

The overarching goal of deployment is to satisfy requirements in the Functional and ~~Performance~~Non-Functional Requirements document and to fulfill the Management Plan approved by the OGB. The line of business is ultimately responsible for end user acceptance. To achieve this, it must work with key stakeholders, especially end users, throughout deployment to resolve issues as they arise.

Actions outside the control of the line of business (e.g., regulatory changes) are recorded in the acquisition strategy and tracked at program reviews throughout deployment. Activities undertaken during this phase vary widely and are tailored for the solution or capability being implemented.

2.8.3.8 Operation and Retirement Added 1/2017

The operating service organization operates, maintains, secures, and sustains systems and services in real time to provide the level of service required by users and customers. The providing line of business oversees and manages service delivery within their area of responsibility. This includes managing resources within specific geographical areas, and may involve emergency sustainment actions in response to natural disasters or other unanticipated events.

When a fielded capability is projected to be unable to satisfy service demand or when another solution offers improved safety or security, lower cost, or higher performance, the providing line of business initiates action to enter the need assessment phase leading to a new initiative. The providing LOB must remove and dispose of fielded assets and services when they are no longer needed. This activity includes restoration of locations where obsolete products or services were deployed, proper disposal of government property and records, recovery of precious metals, and cannibalization of useful assets.